HE PROTESTANT

July-Aug.-Sept., 1950

—a tract of the Incarnation.

JUL 1951

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

COMMON SENSE ABOUT KOREA

l. VIII No. 8

25 cents

THE PROTESTANT

JULY-AUG.-SEPT. 1950

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
John Hammond Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Ruth Nanda Anshen
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Lee H. Ball
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Rev. Otto Brand
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Rev. Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Paul J. Folino
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Chester E. Hodgson
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard,Jr.
Rev. Frederick D. Kershner
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. Donald Lothrop
Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. H. D. A. Major
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Rev. Dryden L. Phelps
Rev. Adam Clayton Powell
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. D. R. Sharpe
Rev. Imre Somogyi
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. O. Walter Wagner
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman

THE PROTESTANT is published quarterly by New Christian Books, 327 W. 27 St., New York, N.Y. Editorial and Executive Offices of The Protestant, Cambridge Station, King's Co., N.S., Canada. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.00; 24 issues $5.00 in the United States and South America. 25 cents additional postage in Canada and foreign countries. Printed in the U.S.A. Copyright 1950, by New Christian Books.

Freedom in a Fog

Britons and Americans are free but in a fog made of newspaper headlines, churchmen's pronouncements, radio comments, government statements, a fog more impenetrable than any iron curtain and a thousand times more dangerous.

The best thing to do in a fog is to stay still until the fog is dispersed, until some clear picture emerges of where you are. Otherwise you are apt to run your head into a lampost.

The Korean Lampost

Korea has given us a fearful bump. If we keep rushing hither and yon we shall receive other bumps, maybe even get run over by a bus. We thought we could clean up the Korean business in a week. If we had kept out it would have been over in three days.

It was a revolution, the same revolution that has been proceeding all over Asia and in parts of Europe. It was not an invasion. The Koreans are the most homogeneous people in the world. But our fog called it an invasion and we are now hitting our heads against the fact that our enemy is not an invading Northern army but the whole people of Korea. As I write we are bombing villages as we retreat, not Northern but Southern villages. The enemy is all around us. We are fighting the Korean people. It was the fog that made us do that.

This is an attempt to lift some of the fog of misinformation about ourselves and the Koreans and to find out how we ever got into such a mess.

The first fact that confronts our eyes in the clear light is that a revolution is proceeding throughout the continent and islands of Asia. This revolution has been hailed as an inevitable historic movement by our liberals and churchmen.

The second fact is that we, the West, have been sitting on this revolution wherever it is taking place. Whenever a peasant has put his hand upon a piece of landlord's soil it has been transfixed by a bayonet marked Britain or America or France.

How could we confuse our people (with their own revolutionary tradition) about this revolution? Easy enough. Just tie it up with our hysterical fear of Bolshevism.

And this is the third fact the understanding of which, if we could recognize it for what it really is, could guide us back to sanity. That is our over-ruling fear of the Russians. This fear of the Russians, which masks a deeper fear, not of the Russians but of our own inner ripening desire for change, of the possibility that our own people might want to try a bit of socialism for them-

selves, has paralyzed us. This fear although not basically of the Russians has been fixed on the Russians by our opinion-makers who (let us be frank) represent by and large those elements in our population whose lives would be most upset by fundamental change.

Liberals, Fogged and Fagged!

But, you say, what of liberal editors whose journals carry no advertising? Can't they speak for the masses?

Up to a point, yes. But evidently the point has been reached where they too (involuntarily perhaps) must exude their share of the fog. And this is tragic, because they will blind many who otherwise might have seen.

One of the reasons for this is the general hysteria in which the government can with impunity break any liberal paper on grounds of endangering national security. Other liberals are suddenly stricken with a "my country right or wrong" patriotism. Others just get tired being pulled two ways and fall over in the direction that pulls the hardest. Of course even in the reactionary camp he will keep flying his flag of neutrality.

Ted Thackrey, the brilliant and courageous publisher of "The Compass," New York, cabled Nehru in July asking him to mediate the Korean conflict and so prevent World War III.

A supporting editorial by I. F. Stone presents the idea which is a good one in a very unfortunate manner. Stone admits at the outset that the UN without China and the U.S.S.R. is no longer a world organization. Nevertheless he doesn't blame the U.S. for this. But it is the fault of the U.S., isn't it? To be specific it is U.S. influence which has kept China out of the UN ever since last January and has allowed an anti-China vote to be cast in its stead. Isn't this a fact?

Yes, Stone admits that the world United Nations Organization as of July, 1950, was a legal shadow. The substance was an anti-Soviet League. For the moment at least the chalk-blue flag of the UN flew over a revived armed and fighting anti-Comintern. Where then was there a ground or medium for negotiation?

It was for this purpose that Stone and Thackrey introduced Nehru. The same idea had occurred previously to "Reynolds News" of England. The idea was welcome to Stalin, unwelcome to Truman. Yet Stone strikes up the neutral liberal tune of the Two Big Brutes.

"Who better than Nehru," says Stone, "to see the cant of both sides? The tommyrot about non-interference from the two most interfering Powers in the world?....the hypocrisy about devotion to the UN....the terrible fears and egotism of the two great Powers which threaten to tear the world apart between them as they have already done with Korea?"

Yet in a later paragraph (unfortunately many of his readers will have forgotten what went before) Stone says "The Soviet Union, as a socialist state, certainly does not need war. Its leader, Stalin, has been trying for several years to get a general settlement."

This is true enough. It is borne out by the kind of weapons and the positions taken up by each side, the U.S. specializing in aggressive bombers, the Soviets in defensive fighters, the U.S. taking up positions far from American shores, near the borders of Russia, Russia taking positions only near her own borders.

To repeat what Stone says, "as a socialist state" Russia doesn't need war and he might have added that as a capitalist state America does need war or at least the apprehension of war, "cold war," which supports an armament economy. Doesn't that make a difference between America and Russia? A very important, in fact a crucial difference? Why then talk of "the cant of both sides," as if this crucial difference did not exist?

Stone speaks of "the familiar tragi-comedy of the cry of 'bandits' arising from both Moscow and Washington." But does Stone really consider that Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-Shek are not bandits? And does he really think Kim Il Sung and Mao Tse-Tung are bandits? Stone himself admits in this very editorial, depending once more on that strange disjunction of the "liberal" mind which permits it to swallow contradictions without gagging, sometimes even savoring them as "ambiguities," that in Asia (and he could have added Europe, the Middle East, Latin America and Africa) "American Power almost everywhere has been drawn into the support of colonialism." Been drawn? How could it have been drawn if it had not been the very nature of American power to support colonialism? It is true enough that colonials call their oppressors "bandits" and are called "bandits" by their oppressors. But should this be the cue for "liberals" to equate the oppressor with the oppressed?

Just what is the special crime of the oppressed today that justifies this neutrality among our liberals? Can it be the fact that the oppressed today are growing too strong and that they have in the U.S.S.R. a powerful champion?

Have our liberals lived so long with freedom's victories perverted that they can't face a clean-cut political and economic liberation? Would such a thing disturb their vocation as comfortable champions of lost causes? The political victories over which they yearned, as in the Philippines, as in India herself, never fruited in basic economic change. The economic structure remained through the political face-lifting. So these facade revolutions have been safe for our predatory society to live with. And safe for our liberals to celebrate. It is when these revolu-

tions threaten to remove the prey of the eagle that it becomes unsafe to praise them.

Our liberals are tired. They are going to bed. But in the middle of the night they will be rudely awakened and they will be sent to join the bolsheviks in Mr. Hobbs' Concentration Camps. For reaction-turned-fascism will not want them around.

There is a type of liberalism which has become an institution. It has been in business a long time and proposes to stay in business. It is typical of this liberalism to take for granted the innocence of our government but to scold it for being clumsy or stupid.

For instance Willard Shelton in "The Nation" (July 29, 1950) complains not that our policy is wrong but that we are "slowfooted and clumsy" in carrying it out. MacArthur's cease-fire imposed on Chiang "was followed by Mr. Truman's attempt to clarify our policy regarding Formosa by announcing that under no circumstances are we contemplating annexation but are concerned solely with temporary expedients to check a spread of overt war in the Far East."

If there was one way to start overt war in the Far East it was to try to prevent China from completing her revolution. Yet Mr. Shelton's only comment is: "The prospect, viewed from any angle, is grim. We can only hope for time to build up our armed strength to a point at which our commitments are matched by power in being."

But the prospect is not only grim. It involves us in crime. And this our liberal will never say.

Why should there be a hope for time to build up armed strength? There can be no such hope. It is indeed immoral to indulge in such a hope. For it is the same 1939 hope when the West hoped Russia would oblige us by standing and being slaughtered by the Germans. Only this time there are no Germans to do the slaughtering for us. We showed the world our capacity for doing that sort of thing at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. At this writing we are burning villages in South Korea, while retreating under cover of South Korean troops. See the story in the "N.Y. Times" August 2, 1950.

How we dote on such meaningless phrases as "power in being." What, pray tell, is power out of being? Why not say what we mean? Rocket-bombs, atom-bombs, any kind of bombs we can safely throw that will kill people without inconveniencing ourselves.

Many Americans are writing to their government: why don't we drop the bomb on them? It is not that the American people are especially callous. They simply want to get the thing over quickly, so they can get back to normal living. For the people of the U.S. are no more enthusiastic about this war than are the

Swedes who are sending an ambulance unit or any other of the 52 members of the UN that are sending token forces or no forces at all to this crusade of what Dulles calls the Free Nations.

For Dulles and his like this war is really serious. It is their baby. They are committed up to their ears in all-out war against humanity's coming of age. But the American people are not yet sold on this war. And this liberal eye-wash about "power in being" and "hope for time" will never sell them on putting down revolutions in blood, especially when a good proportion of that blood is American.

No braver or decenter people exist than the Americans. But they are being involved by their Bankers, Bishops and Brass in a cowardly and indecent adventure.

"In Fact" is in a much higher class as a liberal paper than "The Nation." Yet it supports U.S.-UN intervention in Korea and denounces North Korean "invasion" as aggression.

"In Fact" quotes and agrees with "Reynolds News" as it comments thus: "We have no sympathy with the corrupt and inefficient Governments which in Southern Korea have obstructed land redistribution and other reforms, and have taken over much of the technique of brutality and repression with which the Japanese held down the country. But that is not the point."

That is, however, very much the point. It is the point overlooked altogether too casually by liberals who have strangely swallowed the lie that the Korean war was Russia-inspired or that at least Russia could have stopped it at any time she wished.

A Southern Korean unionist who has been beaten up and hung on a meat hook by his shoulder blades has neither stomach nor time for phrases like "techniques" of repression taken over from the Japanese. These techniques are the same for all repression. There is nothing especially Japanese about them. The only thing the Korean knows is that his union, nearly half a million strong, was squashed by the heel of the U.S.-protected South Korean government and he needs help. As between remaining on the hook and thus appeasing Atomerica and getting the iron hook out of his back he chooses the latter. Who will get him down off that hook?

The great U.S., champion of freedom, has helped put him up there. Only the North Koreans can and will get him down, his own brothers and cousins, Koreans from the Northern part of Korea. That is the meaning of this Korean war.

"Humanity's immediate need is for peace," goes on "Reynolds News."

But a peasant starved for land cannot eat peace. There are millions of him in South Korea. Is he not humanity? These liberals identify peace with a quiet life for themselves. The fact

is that as the U.S. gets deeper planted in the swamp of aggressive war the margin of liberty for liberals grows narrower. Do they sense this and, desiring to stay in business, give their approval to a crime in the hope of staying on good terms with a government which can crack down on them any minute it pleases on the ground of disloyalty.

George Seldes himself makes this threat vivid ("In Fact" July 31, 1950): "The Korean conflict has made the threat of (American) native fascist forces more dangerous than ever.

"Under the cover of hostilities, making full use of the country's antagonism toward Russia and communism, these groups are making tremendous strides toward achieving the objectives they long ago set out to attain.

"Current examples are the Hobbs concentration camp bill which provides for internment of 'subversive' and other aliens. After nine years, this measure was passed by the House July 17 with only 15 dissenting votes.

"The armed forces have already rules that GI's must take a loyalty oath which includes 'sympathetic association' with any of 175 organizations, many of them anti-fascist and in no way subversive. The announced procedure is that the suspected soldier is guilty until he proves his innocence—and this proof must come from sources other than the individual involved—a virtually impossible task and a complete contradiction of democratic procedure. Soldiers are also instructed to spy on their comrades in arms, to report any 'disloyal or subversive' activities.

"Should the Korean war spread, its political effect will be felt in virtually every household that once housed a Roosevelt New Dealer.

"The Un-American Activities Committee list of more than 1,000,000 will become the masterlist in the search for 'subversives.'

"Every reactionary to fringe fascist outfit and individual will be elevated to positions of respectability in the new crusade."

We yield to none in our gratitude to George Seldes for his incomparable service in keeping the nation aware of the paralysis of fascism which has been creeping over it in the past decade. But we cannot agree that it is "the Korean conflict" that is making our fascist threat more dangerous. And we marvel that seeing so clearly one side of the fascist coin he fails to see the other.

We believe that for the Korean nation to have further endured the oppression of two-thirds of its people would have been to betray itself AND WORLD PEACE. For world peace is not a thing dreamed up by card players. It is not an abstract thing. It cannot exist with the cancer of colonialism eating into it.

No, it is not "the Korean conflict" but it is U.S. interference on the counter-revolutionary side of the Korean conflict that opens the way to our own counter-revolution masking the Counter-Reformation which today takes the form of clerical-fascism.

Acheson, Warren, Truman, echoed by Attlee, Jebb and the others, have said that the UN wasn't going to be blackmailed into voting China onto the Security Council because of the war in Korea.

But actually when and by whom was the original blackmailing carried out? There was no war in Korea last January when the U.S. rounded up (how, except by threat of economic sanctions?) the votes of France, Cuba, Ecuador, Formosa and Egypt against China. Britain, having already recognized China (desiring to retain her China investments and Hong Kong) tried to keep in with both sides by abstaining from the vote, as did Norway, likewise torn between what was palpably right and what was palpably profitable.

Russia Struck At Injustice

Perhaps it was wrong for Russia to walk out. Ted Thackrey thinks she was. We think she was right to walk out. She didn't say she would not some day return. As we write she has returned. But it can only be to make her position crystal clear to the world.

By walking out she struck as hard as she could, short of abandoning the UN entirely, at a monumental injustice. Russia acted on the Thomist principle that peace is the product of justice.

And here is something our liberal friends have forgotten altogether: this principle is as true for the atomic age as for any other age. Russia moved towards the area of diplomacy that borders on war. Russia needs peace for more and greater reasons than the West. Yet Russia r i s k e d war in order to gain the only basis for peace: justice.

This Korean war has already turned out to be as much against South Koreans as against North Koreans. And on the home front the President has asked the people to call on the F.B.I. to round up enemies, proclaiming open season on all non-conformists. It is not hard to imagine the field day ahead for all the little bigots that will crawl out of the woodwork with the grudge lists they have been preparing. Some victims on these lists will be most surprised.

First—known Communists are to be jailed. The office of the U.S. Attorney General J. Howard McGrath has announced it. Then sympathizers with Communism. Already a number of these have been jailed, among them the world-famous author Howard Fast. But then Trotskyists, Titoists, Americans for Democratic Action, and finally (as George Seldes says) honest democrats of every kind. To destroy the concept and the name of dem-

ocracy is the final aim of the counter-revolution which, we repeat, masks the Counter-Reformation now released in the U.S.

On the eve of his taking office Attorney General McGrath made a speech before the supreme convention of the Knights of Columbus, spearhead of this historic movement to wipe out democracy. He called for "the bold offensive" on the part of America's Roman Catholics, "resolute and muscled," not "affecting a silken piety or some sentimental vaporing." "And if we Catholics must stand alone in that battle—far better the valiant few than the indifferent many. The Spartan advice still holds: 'If the sword is too short, stay close to thine enemy.'" As an indication of the lamb-like innocence (or is it the stultifying appeasement?) of our liberal organizations the Anti-Defamation League gave McGrath its "annual tribute to those who make distinguished contributions to America's democratic legacy."

So our liberals heil the new Hammer of God. So they light their smoky candles. To bed and oblivion they go.

The Unrepentant Church

The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches was in session in Toronto during the early days of the Korean war and commended the UN Security Council for its "prompt decision" in authorizing a "police measure" to meet the North Korean "attack". The Committee also protested "against the exploitation of non-self-governing peoples and flagrant violations of human rights." In view of the Korean crisis they might have named the U.S.-supported government of South Korea as a violator of these rights. They failed to do this.

Thus world Protestantism gave its moral support to the UN Security Council in its authorization of U.S. intervention in the Korean revolution after that intervention had taken place.

That this action had already included the bombing of civilians was perhaps not known to the committee. That this action was taken in behalf of an anti-popular terrorist regime surely they must have known. Western leaders of the new ecumenical Christianity, however, have become quite sophisticated in these matters and accept with realistic fortitude the fact that innocents must die that the Kingdom of Profit may stay. At any rate they laid down no conditions to their approval of this "police action" such as, for instance, that it should not include bombing of populated areas or that the U.S. should give up trying to wreck the Security Council by allowing a defunct anti-Chinese regime to sit in place of China.

A little later in July, at Whitby, Ontario, the International Missionary Council, representing 31 national mission organizations and Christian councils in 25 countries, met and assured Korean Christians of "our acute concern and our prayers."

What must Korean Christians be thinking of these prayers mocked by approval of our "Christian" government's bringing the horrors of war upon them?

The "World Alliance for International Friendship Through Religion" whose secretary, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, has labored long and actively in the cause of world peace, recently issued a stirring call to the American people to enlist in "a moral crusade for peace," saying that "to exclude the possibility of negotiation" between East and West "is to forfeit hope for peace," and asking us "to recognize the existence of a world revolution in our time and to acknowledge as valid the struggle to achieve political independence, improved living conditions, and basic human rights for all peoples." Here was the kind of understanding and guidance the downtrodden masses of the world could have expected from a "World Alliance for International Friendship through Religion." But now (July 30, 1950) in the opening stages of an actual concrete revolution, in Korea, this same body suddenly calls that revolution "a clear-cut case of aggression," supports U.S.-UN intervention and says that this intervention "may well serve to strengthen the moral force of the United Nations."

The World Alliance makes its statement jointly with the Church Peace Union and speaks of "the support which the United States has given to the resolutions of the Security Council in connection with the Korean action," thus reversing the order of things. It was the Security Council that supported the U.S. armed intervention, positively in Korea by calling for military assistance from members of the UN and negatively (but not less effectively) in Viet Nam, the Philippines, and in the Chinese island of Formosa where the Security Council silently acquiesced in American intervention.

The Western church turns a deaf ear to the Hungarian Bishop Bereczky's call to repentance. Some day we may heed that call when it is too late to save us from the condemnation of God and the punishment of history.

Back now to June 25, 1950.

Before considering the events of that day and the days immediately preceding let us look briefly at a few facts about Korea. On any map of Asia we can see that Korea is a largely mountainous peninsula jutting down from North China and almost reaching Japan.

The Koreans are a Mongolian people with a very ancient civilization. They were comparatively advanced when Japan was still in savagery. Koreans brought to Japan its first culture.

The Japanese invaded Korea in 1592. They were not expelled until six years of devastation had left bitter memories in the minds of the Korean people.

After the Russo-Japanese war, in 1905, U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt curried favor with the rising power of Japan by helping her to occupy Korea as a protectorate.

So the Koreans, a proud people of thirty million people, have suffered their gethsemane on the cross of colonial exploitation and as victims of Western perfidy.

They had never known real friendship from white nations before the Soviet Union came along and extended a kind of help which increased rather than diminished their self-respect.

North Korea has a widely representative popular front government which in five years has changed the country from a Japanese colonial outpost to a genuinely progressive democracy.

Under the Japanese, four out of five peasants had rented their land and paid the landlord 80% of their crop. These peasants were also at the mercy of the fertilizer companies and the money lenders. Their lives were living deaths. The new government took the land from the Japanese and Korean landlords and gave it to the peasants who woke up politically and declared war on their own backwardness. Vast new areas have been brought under irrigation.

Everybody, old and young, studies. In the capital is a national ballet, and a movie studio. There are 16 institutions of higher learning. Over 2 million out of 10 million are going to school. Books, magazines and newspapers are issuing from the presses.

The industrial plants, wrecked by the retreating Japanese, have been put back into production. The Russians helped greatly in this, but these plants today are run by Koreans who under the Japanese had done only unskilled manual labor.

Meanwhile under a regime sponsored by the U.S. 20 million South Koreans had suffered a deterioration in agriculture, education, industry and general morale.

Why the South Koreans Ran

Before thinking of the legal aspects of what happened let us look at the human motivation of the events of June 25, 1950 and after. On that day the North Korean army began moving down through the artificial barrier of the 38th parallel into the territory controlled by Syngman Rhee's regime. For a time there was little opposition.

As they moved South this army divided the landlord's estates and gave them to the land-starved peasants.

Syngman Rhee's South Korean army melted away. Why? Was it because they were terrified by tanks, as has been suggested in our newspapers? This is hardly an explanation. An artificial line drawn across a country cannot turn those on one side of it into cowards and on the other side into heroes. North Kor-

eans fight on under bombardment from every form of U.S. aircraft. Why should South Koreans run from tanks? No, this will not do. Perhaps a better explanation would be that the South Korean army had been trained as a police force to repress the revolution in South Korea (the same revolution that is engulfing all Asia), they had killed tens of thousands of their own people, imprisoned scores of thousands, bathed their country in blood. When their brothers from the North confronted them they fled not from tanks but from the consciousness of their crimes for which they must now give an accounting.

It had become a virtue in South Korea among these oppressed people to get even with the police. Take the word of two Roman Catholic missionaries on Cheju Island for this. They told correspondents as quoted by Hugh Deane in the N.Y. "Compass": "Hardly a family on this island but has had at least one of his family beaten by the police. And when the people pick themselves up off the ground, they are leftists—or at least getting even with the police has become one of their chief aims in life."

The testimony of these priests is supported by the report of the United Nations Commission on Korea which tells that the South Korean police force was carried over from the Japanese regime and describes mass tortures and massacres of the people by the government.

"In the summer of 1947," says Deane, "I visited the village of Sam Kil, North Cholla Province, which a few days before had been looted by one of Syngman Rhee's youth groups. When the villagers refused to pay 500 won per family, about 100 men arrived in trucks. They broke in the doors, smashed the crocks of soya beans, kicked in the clay stoves, lashed the women and drove off the livestock."

Now the truth we must face is that the U.S. Government was sponsoring all this. Those too squeamish Americans who objected were sent out or went out. Burton E. Martin, an educational adviser who objected to the torture of school children was transferred to Japan.

E.C.A. labor adviser Stanley Earl was denied his request to be sent back to Washington to explain what was going on. "I did not think the American labor movement should lend itself to anything so corrupt."

Deane says he filled his own notebooks with "descriptions of a society in agony." He tells of tortured boys and girls he talked with, of a labor leader who had undergone two months of such tortures as "water treatment, immersion in human excrement, beatings till he could not see or hear." In June, 1949, Rhee arrested 22 employees of the National Assembly and when they were released 16 out of the 22 had broken skulls or punctured ear-drums. Even an anti-Communist Korean editor was moved

to quote a peasant proverb: "Keep a dog from water and he will bite. The Korean people have been kept from the water of freedom and decency. Some biting is to be expected."

The Los Angeles "Korean Independence" (June 21, 1950) printed a statement by Young Lee, Chairman of the Working People's Party. Lee describes in some detail Syngman Rhee's reign of terror. He tells of women's breasts being sliced off, victims tortured by U.S.-made electric tools and thus driven insane, disembowelling, putting out eyes, cutting off noses and ears, beating to death and hanging victims' heads above the streets.

Legalizing Crime

Now, no sooner had the Northern army crossed the 38th parallel than the United States without consulting anybody started to bomb the North Koreans. As General MacArthur says, he spits in their eyes first and talks afterwards. That is precisely what the U.S. did. Evidently the U.S. government takes orders from the Pentagon on which MacArthur has the Indian sign.

After this armed intervention had become an accomplished fact the U.S. called a meeting of the Security Council (June 27, 1950) to take action on Korea. They decided to make an honest woman out of the U.S. and to "legalize" her illegal intervention.

Consider the essence of the situation. Here is the Security Council, France and Britain, both beneficiaries of all kinds of aid from the U.S., sitting down with the U.S. to decide on a question which the U.S. had already answered. Joining the permanent members were the other members, Egypt, Norway, Cuba and Ecuador. The Russian vote wasn't there and instead of the Chinese vote there was an anti-Chinese vote present. And the thus cut-in-half Security Council sponsored U.S. intervention. A banquet for Mars on a two-legged table. It won't stand!

Let us suppose that the situation were reversed.

Suppose for instance that the U.S., a nation of only one-third the population of China, had been the one to be excluded. And suppose that some of the others had been India, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and that the People's Government of China occupied a place on the Council, what would Britain have done? Or France? Would they have called it a Council? The answer is, no, they would not. It is the same answer that the Russians have given to the present set-up. It was not a Council, they walked out of. It is not a Council Malik walked back into. It is a counterfeit.

The Security Council of June 27, 1950, was a council not of the United Nations but of the Divided Nations. The premise of division which has been preached in the West from Churchill's Fulton speech to the present time had borne its fruit. It is in accordance with this premise that the ghost of the China that is dead and buried is allowed to sit in China's seat in the Security

Council. This ghost is anti-Communist. That is enough to qualify it. That is enough to qualify Rhee or anyone else anywhere in the world. The United Nations idea had absorbed the Truman Doctrine by dollar osmosis and was on June 27, 1950, a complete expression of that Doctrine.

The Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Gromyko called the Security Council's ratification of American intervention illegal and based this charge of illegality on Article 27 of the Charter of the United Nations. This Article stipulates that important decisions of the Security Council must have the positive vote of all five permanent members of the Council, namely U.S.A., U.S.S.R., U.K., France and China.

U.S. apologists say this rule had been broken before without effective protest from Russia. But breaking a rule does not take away the rule. And since U.S. apologists are talking rules they should not lean on such a broken reed as past breaches of that rule, even had they been made over important matters.

Certainly there has never been a more important matter than this Korean matter. Here was a crisis in the life of the UN. There had been times, as in the Dutch-Indonesian war, when Russia had insisted on withdrawals to original positions exactly as now the U.S. insisted on such a withdrawal in Korea. On those occasions the Western nations had voted the Russians down. The Russians had not gone to war over it.

Now U.S. apologists may say Russia didn't have the power or influence in the UN to command a majority whereas the Western nations did have that power and influence. But if they say that they have changed their ground from law to force for no majority can break its own law. In the argument from law the Russian position would seem to be incontestable.

The U.S.'s basic policy is not peace but containment and she has dragooned the UN when she could do so and has often used force (military power alliances outside the UN as in the Atlantic Pact) when she has felt it more expedient in her efforts to "contain" and push back the tides of world revolution.

This policy of "containment" was not forced on the U.S. It was chosen deliberately. It was a negative policy. A positive policy might just as well have been chosen, a positive policy which would have put the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. in the position of rivals for the affection of the rising peoples rather than permitting the U.S.S.R. to become their sole champion while the U.S.A. became their greatest enemy.

But, you say, force is used on the revolutionary side too. Yes, and it is not strange that force is used on the revolutionary side. The whole point of a revolution is to tear down and rebuild systems of law which had crystallized out of an accumulation of bad habits, in this case habits of exploitation and enslavement.

The amount of force necessary to replace the structure of an old society is directly proportional to the degree of strength left in that society and to its ability to put on itself a winning face before its own people, in other words to give them the illusion that they have something worth fighting for.

The status quo today, as represented by U.S. armed force possesses a degree of bleak military power but there is nothing very winning about the face of the Wall Street evangelist John Foster Dulles or the face of General Douglas "spit-in-their-eyes" MacArthur or the smiling countenance of Chiang Kai-shek whom Stillwell called a "treacherous snake." We are certainly not winning Koreans by bombing their open cities and villages.

The status quo today is pretty well naked force and nothing else. Its catchwords of Christianity and Civilization shrivel in the flesh-burning breath of our flame-throwers. The "acute concern and prayers" of our Christian leaders make no difference at all to the mothers and their little children we tear apart and scatter over the back roads and out-of-the-way places in far Korea.

Nor did this bleak power only begin on June 25, 1950. It has been used constantly by the U.S.-Rhee regime ever since Rhee was flown to Korea in a U.S. plane to begin his anti-popular rule.

In other words there is force on both sides in Korea. But in the one instance it has been used to break labor unions and keep the peasants in a state worse than slavery. And in the other instance it is being used to establish a people's government to serve the people. It is too bad there is not a different word for force used by a Chiang Kai-shek and force used by a Mao Tse-tung.

Preparedness Proves Nothing

About the only argument used to prove that North Korea was the aggressor is that it was better prepared than South Korea.

But it is not true that the better prepared of two contestants must necessarily have started the contest. Frequently the less prepared may have been pumped up with delusions of grandeur and thinks he is the better prepared. Even in 1949 the South Korean Defence Minister Sihu Sung Mo said in a press conference, "We are strong enough to march up and take Pyongyang (the capital of North Korea) within a few days." After all the South Koreans are twice the population of the North and had been definitely told they would be backed by the U.S. See the full confession of this by Dulles in the "N.Y. Times" (Magazine Section) July 30, 1950.

As to preparedness, William C. Foster, deputy administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, told the Senate Committee on Appropriations, June 13, 1950, that "the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. The reasons for optimism are military, political and economic. A rigor-

ous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers; one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces; and one that has cleaned out the guerrilla bands in South Korea in one area after another."

Further testimony was given by E.A.J. Johnson, director of E.C.A.'s Korean division. Johnson Said, "Elimination of guerrillas in Chiju-Do was a tough job. In the process about 10,000 out of 30,000 houses on Chiju-Do were destroyed, but the island is now peaceful and quiet." The guerrillas, he said, had been reduced from 3,000 to 250.

From this and other similar evidence it would seem that the South Korean army's energies may have been expended and its morale sapped in "policing" South Koreans. It is undoubtedly true that under Russian training the North Koreans were thoroughly prepared and that the South Koreans were trained with equal thoroughness by the Americans. Moreover we must repeat what is usually overlooked that the Southern regime was backed and knew it would be supported by the armed might of America.

There must be some other factor that explains the swift melting away of Southern resistance. Why did Seoul fall with scarcely a battle? Why are the American lines so easily infiltrated? Why do the Northerners encounter so little resistance in their runs down the coast and across the interior? Can it be the North Korean soldiers are as popular in the South as in the North? Are Southern peasants protecting them? Could the Southern workers, whose unions were brutally broken by Rhee's government, be sabotaging the UN war effort because it is not their war?

This blaming the North because it was better prepared is a poor crutch of an argument and shows how lame is the case of the U.S. in trying to justify its own aggression.

The North Koreans have specified the exact place and time of the South Korean aggression:

From 10 p.m., June 23, to 4 a.m. June 24, the South Koreans shelled Dai Dong in Cu Bek Sung county with more than 200 shells from howitzers and mortars. Beginning at 12:25 a.m., June 23, a similar bombardment was made on the Ka Ga Yu area in Bok Shing county. North Korea claimed violations of the border had been made by Southern troops between May 19 and 22. In the first week in June the Pyongyang radio announced twenty-five other attacks. (Stated by the New China News Agency, June 26.)

The non-communist "N.Y. Herald Tribune," Aug. 5, 1949, carried a story from its Korean correspondent: "The one outstanding thing about the South Korean army, now it has been purged several times of Communist infiltrators, is its outspoken desire to take the offensive against North Korea. It wants to cross the border. Its best officers are Japanese-trained professionals,

with a fine frosting of American Army training." A United Press dispatch in the same paper carried the interview with South Korean Defence Minister Sihu Sung Mo as quoted above and with this addition: "If we had our own way, we would, I'm sure, have started up already, but we had to wait until they are ready. They keep telling us, 'No, no, no, wait. You are not ready.'"

Who are "they"?

On March 2, 1950 ("N.Y. Times") Syngman Rhee told the South Koreans that in spite of advice from "friends from across the seas" the call of "our brothers in distress" in North Korea could not be ignored. "To this call we shall respond."

Who were "the friends from across the seas" whose advice irked Rhee? What did they mean by telling the South Koreans to wait until they were ready? And when they w e r e ready what were they to be ready for?

Suppose the North Koreans knew all about this readying and took pains to get ready themselves. Suppose they were more thorough in their preparations. What we falsely call the cold war had been using gun powder in Korea for years. The war had been simmering and boiling over. On the testimony of the UN's own commission the casualties in this war were in the hundreds of thousands. Fascism i s war. And fascism is what we planted with Syngman Rhee in South Korea.

This blow launched out of the North against Southern fascism was not launched out of a vacuum. It was launched in the midst of an UNDECLARED WAR. The North did not break a peace. They continued a war.

The U.S. attempt to use the argument of Northern preparedness to manoeuver the South Koreans into the role of an abused people, whom the U.S. (and UN) must rescue, will not succeed. It will not succeed even in South Korea itself, for the people of South Korea know who w a s abusing them and now they know who i s abusing them.

In the Russian-built tanks come Koreans, but in the American-built bombers come Americans. There is a vital difference between the two.

Hasty Justice No Justice

Justice uses but is never used by the arm of the law.

Justice is deliberate in distinguishing between the right and wrong of a quarrel.

Yet General MacArthur took justice into his own hands and committed American ground troops in Korea before orders to do so had come from the U.S. government.

And the U.S. government committed itself to armed intervention within the boundaries of four foreign countries (Viet Nam, Philippines, China and Korea) as if she were the agent of

law and order without authorization from any institution of law and order.

Both General MacArthur and the U.S. government acted in the Ku Klux Klan tradition of the lynch mob.

Having whipped its people and what it calls the "Free Nations" into a fury of hatred of Communism the U.S. released that fury into action.

Then, after the trap of action had been sprung, the U.S. called a meeting of a Security Council which had been turned into an anti-Russian Council by the exclusion of the world's largest nation, China.

Hastily, without inquiring into the merits of the case, this "Council" jumped to the conclusion that Northern Korea was in the wrong and should be punished.

The punishing has been severe. Public work which it had taken years of patient sacrifice to build, hospitals, schools, cultural centers, homes of the people, have been destroyed in the twinkling of an eye.

Had the U.S. been able to restrain its rage to destroy the achievements of a people's government, had any consideration whatever been given to justice by the UN, an order would have been issued by its Secretary General for both parties to the dispute to bring their quarrel to the UN for adjudication.

Why did not Trygve Lie do this?

Johannes Steel has been informed at Lake Success that documents left behind in Seoul by members of the UN Commission for Korea contain the minutes of a joint meeting on Feb. 14, 1949, between the Syngman Rhee cabinet and the chiefs of the South Korean army in which the decision was taken to begin hostilities against North Korea not later than July, 1949. Brig. Gen. William L. Roberts, head of the American military advising group, was present at this meeting and Rhee asked him to relay a request to Washington for more arms. Steel reports:

"Following this meeting, intensive preparations for a war began and as the first step, according to these documents, the South Korean Army General Staff began to draft all men from the ages of 18 to 45 inclusive.

"U.S. military instructors quickly trained six regular divisions equipped with American weapons. The training was carried out in the Rudzan area near Seoul and some 10,000 Japanese non-commissioned and commissioned officers from the former Japanese Imperial Army participated.

"By July, 1949, five South Korean divisions were massed along the 38th parallel, their spearhead formed by crack South Korean units, among them the Harim (Tiger Battalions) deployed at Pookchon. The operative task was to capture Haeju, a town just

north of the 38th parallel.

"Thus the stage was set for the invasion of North Korea. But an incident occurred which evidently showed American military advisers that the South Korean Army was unreliable. This was the desertion during the following week of two battalions of the South Korean Army and their flight into North Korea.

"The documents found in Seoul indicate that Syngman Rhee was then told by American military advisers that the invasion planned for July, 1949, would be premature and that a large-scale purge of the army and civil administration would have to be carried out in South Korea before any offensive was possible.

"The invasion was postponed and, following this advice, a purge was carried out in the South Korean Army in the course of which 55 officers and men were shot and 15,000 weeded out of the Army. Then came an unprecedented terror in the course of which some 50,000 South Koreans were jailed and nearly 100 Korean villages were burned, and their inhabitants either shot or sent to concentration camps.

"After the July, 1949, failure to mount an offensive, all further preparations were carried out in secret; and on Aug. 15, 1949, Syngman Rhee established a restricted area 20 kilometers in depth all along the 38th parallel."

This may not be conclusive but it is certainly sufficient to cast a strong doubt on the premise of U.S.-UN intervention.

Why then did Trygve Lie, until then an independent world figure, suddenly allow himself to be swept overboard by the tide of U.S. urgency?

Quoting Johannes Steel once more ("N.Y. Compass") Lie told personal friends who retailed it to Steel that the U.S. delegation caused him to intervene in the Korean affair "as quickly as he did on the basis of strong assurances that the entire Korean business would be finished in a single week" and that then "he would be able to continue with his peace mission."

In our view this is blackmail with a vengeance. What could be more grimy than to lead this poor bewildered man down such a garden path? Trygve Lie had approached Moscow to try to stop the cold war. Moscow encouraged him. He approached Washington. Washington snubbed him.

When Washington snubbed him did Washington know that something was about to pop in Korea? Certainly it looks like it when one considers the running back and forth of generals to Tokyo, not forgetting the Dulles visit to the 38th parallel front. Now whether the outbreak in Korea came about exactly as Washington expected it to come about or not we don't know. At any rate the outbreak was just the card to help Washington put the finishing

touches on its anti-Red UN coalition a la Herbert Hoover.

Now Trygve Lie is admittedly in a difficult position. It was his duty to stay in the middle between East and West, between Capitalism and Communism, to keep them negotiating, to keep them talking. He has done his best. But his best wasn't good enough. Recently he let himself be drawn into a red-baiting situation by a whipper-snapper of a reporter who grilled him as if he were some minor loyalty suspect in Washington. That he thus lowered himself revealed a weak spot in his character, a sensitiveness to the red charge that made him sound as if he were trying to maintain a secure place on one side of the world rather than to hold the world together. It showed that the world figure was beginning to catch the disease, the paralyzing fear on which our fascist bacillus feeds. The world figure had become a partisan figure.

When the impartiality of the umpire has been thoroughly compromised the game is over. A current cartoon shows the catcher Red China tagging Chiang Kai-shek ten feet from the UN home plate. Uncle Sam is the umpire. "Safe!" he shouts. Not once only, but ever since last January he has been shouting safe.

The only trouble with the cartoon is that Uncle Sam is not the umpire. The UN is the umpire and loses its integrity when it underwrites the "cold war" decisions of the U.S. Yielding to high pressure salesmen from Washington, indulging in the vain hope that they would let him strut his stuff after they were through with him, Trygve Lie compromised his integrity and that of the UN.

Spiritual Maturity of the U.S.S.R.

Logically Jacob Malik should not have returned to the Security Council until it had stanched the wound from which it was bleeding to death. That mortal wound was its refusal to seat the Chinese delegation.

Yet Malik did return. Why? The U.S. delegate Austin says Malik returned to stall off further UN decisions on Korea. But the only reason to stall is to gain time. Yet it is not the U.S.S.R. that needs time. It is the West. It is Britain and France and the U.S. and Western Germany, all of whom find that they are not ready to meet what they call the Russian onslaught. Canada needs six or eight months to prepare even her special brigade of 5000 soldiers for Korea, not to speak of other joint preparations with the U.S. But the West needs time not for Korea only, but to spend U.S. billions on all the things that go to make modern war.

One need not be a military expert; a two-year old child can see the difference in size between two blocks. And a seven-year-old can understand that if the U.S. with absolute air superiority has such trouble beating 10 million North Koreans she will be really up against it even with help from the Free Nations

(Germany, Japan, Spain etc.) to beat a Communist alliance of 800 millions, part of whom are far better-trained and better equipped, especially air-wise, than the Koreans.

This is not difficult to perceive. Churchill has stated it candidly. And the cry goes up all over the West for time. Give us time! Localize the Korean conflict so we can have time! Even the preachers are praying for time. And no one ever gives a thought to the fact that it is only our proposed victim who can give us this time. If we need time more than the U.S.S.R. then for what reason should they give up this advantage?

Surely this is obvious or should be obvious. And what is the time to be used for? It is to be used to arm the West against the U.S.S.R. in what we have said over and over again is an inevitable conflict.

To repeat, what cannot be too often repeated, just as in 1939 we hoped that the Nazis would turn East and that Russia would stand and be gored by the Nazis, so today in 1950 we hope Russia will stand and wait quietly while we get ready to gore her. What a hope!

No, Malik is not in the UN to stall. He is there as the representative of a new socialist civilization confronting a confused mixture of feudal, colonial and finance capitalist powers which, befogged by atomic propaganda, have allowed themselves to become involved with the U.S. in a reckless lunge against Korea and China. He is there to try one last time to present the factual realities of the world situation to men whose obsessive hate blinds them to those realities.

Malik asks the UN to become once more the UN by admitting China. He asks the UN to order foreign troops out of Korea. He asks the UN to stop U.S. bombing of the people of Korea. He asks the UN to return to the function its name implies.

The U.S.S.R. did not have to send Malik back to the UN. Perhaps it was not the effective thing to do. Perhaps the UN has irrevocably broken its own charter and is on a road from which reason cannot move it.

It is our view that in sending Malik back to the UN the U.S.S.R. has proved to history its sober responsibility, its maturity, its patience in the face of contumely, and its devotion to world peace based on justice.

Who Is Upside-Down?

Capitalists make money on wars. They have a use for wars. Capitalist spokesmen on our radios tell, not despondently but exultantly, of the orders for this and that war material which will "keep business going."

For socialists war is a dead loss. There is nothing in their lives to which it can contribute. There is no group in their

economy who will benefit from it.

This makes a profound difference in the attitudes of socialist and capitalist peoples towards the destructiveness of war and especially towards the total destructiveness of the atom bomb. In their basic human natures the peoples of both socialist and capitalist states hate war. But in capitalist states a poisonous weed of self-interest interferes with this natural aversion.

The easy profits and high wages that accompany wars in capitalist countries take the edge off this aversion which is further dulled by brass bands and hypnotic oratory.

Capitalist countries are forever perched on the edge of war. Their unemployed, bored by inactivity, are always ready to throng the recruiting stations. For war is capitalism's quick remedy for over-production. Over-production is the bane of capitalism hacking at both of its legs: profit and employment. War "takes care of" the unemployed, causes under-production (scarcity) of consumers' goods and gives capitalism a new lease on life.

Socialist countries on the other hand can think objectively of war. To them over-production is a fantastic word. There are such needs to be met, such boundaries of ignorance to be pushed back, such challenges to man's instinct for building, such vistas of adventure in creative living! How on earth, they ask, can you over-produce? How can there be unemployment? And the only answer capitalism can give them is: it is the secret holy capitalist creed that without the incentive of private profit there would be no free enterprise and no freedom. So even at the cost of offering human sacrifice to the moloch of war we must stay "free". To the socialist this sounds like upside-down language.

That is why Malik finds it so hard to get across to the Security Council ideas which appear to be self-evident to all mankind: such as that both sides to a dispute should be heard by a judge before judgment is pronounced.

The British delegate says that Malik is "upside-down." From the capitalist point of view (and Britain is having a brilliant "cold war" splurge of capitalism at present) he is correct. From the humanist or human point of view it is the Briton who is standing on his head and therefore quite honestly sees Malik upside-down.

If capitalism had gone completely berserk in Korea there would have been no sense in Malik's return to Lake Success. Diplomacy cannot handle a raging beast. There were, however, traces of caution in the Korean attack, sly, ignoble, yet sufficient to make worthwhile one last attempt by diplomatic methods to blow the spark of caution into a flame of illumination. The caution was shown in the very choice of Korea (a tiny nation) as a victim of open aggression and in the fact that until the time of this writing the atom bomb has not been dropped on Korean cities,

although thousands of tons of other bombs have been dropped.

This faint spark of caution shows that reason has not been quite utterly abandoned in the capitalist half of the world. It is on that trace of reason and on Malik's ability to develop it that the fate of mankind rests.

It is said that Malik is only talking for Asian consumption. Nothing could be farther from the truth. What Malik is saying is common knowledge throughout Asia. They have measured in their own blood and in the torn flesh of their children what American armament can do to them. No, Malik's words are meant for Americans and if they find his words bitter it is because the only hope for world peace is that Americans should be shocked out of their murderous complacency and out of their suicidal hypnosis and made to see clearly the end of the road on which their leaders are taking them: bankruptcy, defeat, suffering, shame!

The American and Canadian press is doing its editorial best to play down Malik's achievement. Yet Malik's broad bold strokes are hard to play down. They have already thrown the U.S. State Department so out of kilter that it has allowed U.S. delegate Austin to more than hint in the Security Council that Russia should be held responsible for the Korean conflict.

A positive diplomatic catalysis may provide a negative military catalysis. Not always do soft words turn away wrath. Sometimes it takes thunder to clear the air.

At any rate Malik is dragging the war secret up to the top of U.S. consciousness. He is forcing those, who plan to make war, to declare on whom they plan to make it. Since it is Russia on whom they plan to make war Malik is exacerbating the State Department by his refusal to play their game of "localizing" the war in Korea. That game is obvious. It is marvellous that the U.S. could expect the U.S.S.R. to wait quietly until the U.S. had eaten up Korea.

To localize the Korean conflict means to keep out of it and let the Koreans settle it. To bring the capitalist half of the world into it is not to localize it but to spread it over that half of the world. But then to expect the other (Communist) half of the world to fall for such horse-play and to stay out of Korea until it is safely "localized" inside the stomach of U.S. finance-imperialism is really a tall order.

A Diplomatic Stalingrad

The meaning of Malik is that we have run out of time. The time has arrived for peace. We must make peace. There is no alternative.

The meaning of Malik is that Russian power stands behind the people of the world to whom peace is as necessary as air and food. It is the same Russian power that not so long ago

held the gate of mankind against the Beast of Berlin. Can Wall Street succeed where Berlin failed? Can Dulles succeed where Pius failed? The answer is coming from two places, Korea and Lake Success.

The Great Design

Walter Lippmann tries to defend Dulles from Malik's suggestion that Dulles gave the South Koreans the signal to attack. But in his own published words Dulles admits that he told the South Koreans that they belonged to something he calls the "Free World" whose "compulsions to common action are powerful," and that "the American people welcome you as an equal partner in the great company of those who make up this Free World, a world which commands vast moral and material power and resolution that is unswerving...I say to you: You are not alone. You will never be alone so long as you continue to play worthily your part in the great design of human freedom."

"Those words...were broadcast into all Korea," says Dulles. ("N.Y. Times" July 30)

What does Dulles mean by this "Free World"? Does he mean the United Nations? Hardly, or he would not need the new phrase. He means a revived anti-Comintern composed of all anti-Communist states which may take the place of the United Nations if the United Nations refuses to play its "part in the great design." What are its "powerful compulsions" and to what "common action" do they compel? The answer is war on the Communist world, cold war, hot war, every kind of war. You think we are jumping to conclusions? Well, for more than three years U.S. bi-partisan foreign policy, one of whose architects is this same Dulles, has operated under the anti-Communist Truman Doctrine. In a world half Communist such a doctrine cuts the world in two. It is provocative, inflaming, inciting to war. Reading Dulles' words against such a background and remembering that Rhee's regime had lost its election and was straining at the leash, having threatened to march into North Korea, having boasted how quickly they could and would subdue North Korea, these words of Dulles could only mean that the U.S. would not leave them unsupported if they would play their part "in the great design."

What Dulles said to Rhee in private we do not yet know. What he quoted himself as saying in public was equivalent to saying: Attack!

It is saddening to watch a "liberal" coming to heel behind his boss. Lippmann knows the tragic path his country treads and he is having an unenviable time trying to fit together in his columns the more or less cautious capitalism which he represents, the berserk capitalism of MacArthur and McCarthy, and the bewildered Truman in the middle.

But, after stretching himself out of joint to defend Dulles, Lippmann (Syndicated Column Aug. 11, 1950) throws his hands in the air. He can find no way to defend the Truman-MacArthur invasion of China via Formosa. He says, in view of the approaching elections it is unrealistic to expect Truman to reverse himself on China. So poor Lippmann is reduced to asking our allies to force us out of China: "But our allies are not so entangled as we are, and they could, acting within the framework of the United Nations, raise a new standard of hope and of peace to which the peoples of the world could rally." Here is the tip-off. The lesser fry in the UN must surround the big fish and herd him into safer waters.

The victory has gone to Malik in exposing the grinning skeleton of "the great design". It was the victory of sanity over vanity, of socialist firmness over capitalist frenzy.

Writing before the end of the drama we can anticipate its verdict because the denouement now developing at Lake Success was prepared in the Chinese Civil War and is now being wrought out in the rice fields of Korea. The curtain will not fall, however, before many thousands of innocent people have had their lives taken from them. Moreover, we may expect the Great Designers to come up with new twists and turns. For the Great Design has a long tradition behind it and those who weave it are cunning, resourceful, and merciless.

The design itself is simple enough. It is Misery on Earth. With two motifs, ignorance and poverty. And these are overlaid with superstition and fear and slavery and war. Pessimistic religion ("man is vile") and optimistic patriotism ("my country right or wrong") are warp and woof of this Design. Its spiders are the priests of profit and the prophets of death.

Shuttling back and forth on its web today in America are the two branches of Christendom which have combined in a church cartel serving and advising the industrial cartels. This church cartel is more to be feared than industry. For industry is comparatively uninhibited and naive. Industry and Church are joined in the person of John Foster Dulles. That is his diabolic importance.

Let us hope that this will be the last time in human history that we shall see the forces of reaction and obscurantism joined to keep mankind in chains. Hope? Yes, but fight too!

THE PROTESTANT PROTESTS

¶ THE PROTESTANT DOES NOT ACCEPT THE VERSION OF THE U.S. ATTACK ON KOREA THAT IS BEING GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD.

¶ We do not believe it was launched as a bona fide action in behalf of the United Nations Organization.

¶ We believe, what even its chief official apologist says openly, that this action is the integrated result of the U.S. so-called "cold war" or "get tough" policy which has operated inside and outside (mostly outside) the United Nations.

¶ UNTIL THIS ACTION IS STOPPED, THE UNITED NATIONS WILL HAVE BEEN TURNED INTO A REACTIONARY COALITION.

¶ Through this attack on Korea, with its concurrent military intervention in the Philippines, in Viet-Nam, and in China, the U.S. State Department, following implicitly Herbert Hoover's suggestion to throw half the world out of the U.N., has turned the U.N. into a sub-agent.

¶ Both economic and ecclesiastic reactionaries are trying to drive the American and British people down the gadarene slope to destruction.

THE PROTESTANT DEMANDS A PLEBISCITE

¶ Because our rulers, in their support of colonialism in Asia, have not consulted the people;

¶ Because our Christian leaders have many times in the past condemned colonialism;

¶ In order to find out what is the attitude of our people towards U.S.-U.N. Intervention in Korea,

¶ We call upon the governments of Canada, U.S. and Britain to hold plebiscites, asking the people whether they approve or disapprove of the U.S.-U.N. war on the Korean people.

AN APPEAL TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FROM KOREANS IN NORTH AMERICA

At this solemn hour when both American and Korean boys are dying on the battlefields in Korea, we Koreans in the United States of America can't help approaching the American people with an appeal which we believe represents the universal sentiment of the absolute majority of our thirty million compatriots.

The present tragedy of Korea saddens our hearts when we realize that the precious sons of the American people—the traditional friends of our people—are shedding blood on the soil of our Fatherland in their futile and senseless armed intervention in the Korean civil war.

To our deep sorrow, the deep-rooted respect and admiration of the Korean people for the lofty spiritual tradition the American people have inherited from their great forefathers—the spirit of humanity and justice—has been woefully shattered by the merciless killing and wounding of innocent Korean civilians under the rain of death from American B-29 superforts.

We make no comment on the demand by some Congressmen for the massacre of the Korean people with atomic bombs!

Korea Is One Nation

The present civil war in Korea is no clash between two different nations across the Thirty-Eighth Parallel. The Thirty-Eighth Parallel is not a frontier of Korea. It is an artificial division of the territory of our country.

Every Korean bitterly hates this arbitrary barrier, for it threatens to strangle the normal and healthy development of the Korean people—political, economic and cultural. The Korean people are one nation with a history of 50 centuries.

The present civil war in Korea is the culmination of a series of bloody and heroic struggles of the Korean people for the unification and independence of their country under the form of government they freely choose.

The present civil war in Korea is the volcanic explosion of the wrath of the entire Korean people against the Syngman Rhee regime in Southern Korea.

The Syngman Rhee regime trampled underfoot the universal desire of the Korean people and disrupted by force and violence the peaceful unification of Southern and Northern Korea which was proceeding through the democratic process of a general election.

Under Syngman Rhee's bloody reign of terror, those advocating the peaceful unification of Korea were arrested, jailed, tortured, and massacred without discrimination and mercy.

The number of these patriots massacred throughout Southern Korea up to the middle of December 1949 exceeded 149,000.

Of these, more than 62,000 were massacred by Syngman Rhee during the six months since July 1949.

On June 11, 1950, Syngman Rhee's police arrested Lee In Kyu and Kim Tai Hong, peace envoys of the Democratic Front for Unification of the Fatherland who on the official invitation of the Southern Korea National Assembly were on their way to Seoul from Pyongyang.

The mission of these envoys was to convey to all the political parties and social organizations in Southern Korea the Fatherland Front's appeal to speed up the peaceful unification of Korea. On June 10 Syngman Rhee's troops had fired on the Yohyon railway depot, designated as a meeting place for an interview between the peace envoys and a representative of the United Nations Commission on Korea.

Nor is this all. Even in August 1948 Syngman Rhee's troops and police began to invade the areas north of the Thirty-Eighth Parallel.

According to the Democratic Front for Unification of the Fatherland, Syngman Rhee's troops and police raided areas north of the Thirty-Eighth Parallel 432 times from January 1949 up to the beginning of August the same year.

The number of Syngman Rhee's soldiers and police mobilized for these operations was more than 49,000. As a result, more than 1,600 farmers were killed or wounded, while 946 others were kidnapped. The number of houses destroyed was 56; more than 3,000 head of domestic animals were stolen, and forests covering an area of 580 Chungbo were reduced to ashes in Kangwon Province alone.

From March to April, 1950, forests covering an area of 500 Chungbo in areas north of the Thirty-Eighth Parallel were burned down by Syngman Rhee's incendiary bombs.

On May 5, 6, and 7, 1950, and from May 19 to 27 the same year, Syngman Rhee's troops shelled continuously with artillery and directed machine-gun fire north of the Thirty-Eighth Parallel.

On June 23 and 24, 1950, Syngman Rhee's troops made an armed invasion along the entire border north of the Thirty-Eighth Parallel.

Hence the present civil war.

To make a long story short, Syngman Rhee's regime should be held responsible for the present civil war in Korea.

Revolutionary Civil War

The present civil war in Korea is a revolutionary war of the Korean people to reunite their divided country. There is no

ground whatsoever for any foreign intervention in the family dispute of the Korean people.

With a heavy heart we Koreans deplore and denounce the present senseless armed intervention by the United States Government in the internal affairs of our Fatherland.

We are deeply grieved that the U. S. armed intervention has forced our thirty million compatriots to fight the sons of the American people on the soil of our Fatherland. For the sons of the American people are dying in vain on the battlefields of a civil war between Koreans. It is tragic indeed.

We Koreans are a peace-loving people. We are anxious and eager to live in peace as a free, united, and independent nation. We hate to see our civil war ignite World War III. Another global war means the self-annihilation of mankind.

Permanent world peace can be preserved only when the right of self-determination of each nation and the freedom of the pursuit of happiness for all are fully guaranteed.

From this firm conviction, we, on behalf of our thirty million compatriots, humbly appeal to the conscience of humanity and to the sense of justice of the American people as well as to their patriotism that they lose no time in demanding that their Government and Congress immediately halt the U. S. armed intervention in the Korean civil war before it develops into a suicidal global conflagration.

The Korean Democratic Front in North America
The American Committee to Support the Korean
Federation of Trade Unions
The Korean Independence News Co.
July 19, 1950

TAKE PITY, FOR GOD'S SAKE!
Appeal to Christian Americans

We, the undersigned Koreans, present this appeal to all the leaders and members of the Christian churches of all denominations and of all other religious groups throughout the United States of America.

Intervening in the present civil war in Korea, the U. S. Government has been pouring into Southern Korea its navy, air and ground forces.

The great ancient city of Pyongyang, the capital of Northern Korea, has been heavily bombed several times by B-29s. Already hundreds or thousands of innocent women and children have become the victims of American bombs.

We would remind you that the city of Pyongyang has been

blessed by the shower of the Christian gospel.

We never dreamed that this sacred city would be laid waste by a shower of American bombs.

Will you take pity upon the innocent people of this city for God's sake?

We want to make it clear to you that the so-called "invasion" of Southern Korea by the Northern Korea troops is purely a family dispute for the purpose of reuniting a divided nation. We are seeking a United Republic. We do not want intervention from any outside nations.

Your noble historical tradition shows that during the American Civil War neither the Unionists nor the Confederates wanted any armed intervention from the outside.

From the standpoint of the Christian principles of peace and love, we sincerely plead with you to use your constitutional right by urging your President and Congress to stop the armed intervention in Korea this minute and to request them to use good offices so as to bring about an amicable and peaceful settlement of the conflict between the forces of Southern and Northern Korea.

We plead for the lives of millions of our Christian and non-Christian brothers and sisters in Korea.

(Signed) Rev. Soon Hyun, retired minister of the Korean Methodist Episcopal Church (35 years minister in Hawaii and Korea)

Rev. Sa Yong Whang, retired minister of the Korean Methodist Episcopal Church (32 years minister in America and Hawaii)

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS:

We thank you for the generous support which has made it possible to strike one more blow for justice and peace.

We ask you to continue this support and to bring the magazine to the attention of those who don't want an American Century of imperialist wars but who do want a life-time of peace for their children.

K.L.

COOL OFF

A Postscript to American History

When we arrived on the beachhead at Plymouth
We were the white folk, they were the red folk.
They had their flintheads, we had our flintlocks,
So we made two laws, one for the flinthead,
One for the flintlock...So we made white peace.

Then we launched outward to our big destiny
Making new beachheads on the world's headlands.
They were the red folk, we were the white folk.
We had the a-bomb, they had the lesser arms,
So we made two laws, one for the lesser arms,
One for the a-bomb...So we made white peace.

P.S. But history moves at a swift pace,
Now 'tis reported the reds have the a-bomb.
If this be true, and we scarcely can doubt it,
How shall we bring to the Asians "free enterprise"?
How shall we bomb down our "civilization"
Into their towns, as we bombed Nagasaki?
How shall we tell them "the gospel of Jesus"
Mangling their babes, if they too have the a-bomb?

P.P.S. Chou en-lai says to us: Cool off!
Look at the map and learn well what it teaches you!
Stay in America, Asia's for Asians!
White peace was gun peace, white peace was bomb peace
White peace was always a war on the non-white.
A grave for this white peace! Let man's peace arise!

Kenneth Leslie